

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 1-30 were rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action summarized claims 1-7, 9-12, 14, 16-19, 22, 24-27 and 29 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,573,506 (hereinafter "Sato").

**Independent claims 1 and 9 and claims depending therefrom**

Claims 1 and 9 recite, *inter alia*, a radiation detector assembly having an adhesive material disposed between a detector substrate and a protective cover, such that the adhesive material is not in contact with the moisture resistant layer.

Applicants respectfully submit that following the Examiner's reading of Sato, the elements of claim 1 of the present application corresponding to those of Sato could only be as follows (*see* Sato, Fig. 1). The claimed detector substrate and the detector matrix array would jointly correspond to the fiber optical plate 10 of Sato. The claimed scintillator would correspond to the scintillator 12 of Sato. The claimed moisture resistant layer would necessarily correspond to the first polyparaxylylene film 14 of Sato. Similarly, the claimed protective cover would necessarily correspond to the second polyparaxylylene film 18.

**Sato does not disclose an adhesive material disposed between a detector substrate and a protective cover.**

Applicants respectfully submit that Sato is certainly missing certain structural elements recited in claim 1 of the present application. As noted above, claim 1 would require that an adhesive material disposed between the detector substrate and the protective cover. In addition, as recited in claim 1, the adhesive material should not be in

contact with the moisture resistant layer. Even if the first and second paraxylylene films 14 and 18 of Sato are assumed to correspond to the claimed moisture resistant layer and the protective cover, respectively, the aluminum layer 16 cannot be treated as the adhesive material of claim 1 because such materials are not generally understood to be adhesive. Certainly Sato does not support that interpretation. Indeed, Sato simply does not provide any such adhesive layer.

Accordingly, neither the aluminum layer nor any other structural element in Sato corresponds to the adhesive material as disclosed in the present application. Therefore, Sato does not teach an adhesive material disposed between the FOP 10 and the second paraxylylene film 18.

**It would be impossible to add an adhesive material to Sato that would be disposed between the fiber optical plate (FOP) 10 and the second paraxylylene film 18 without being in contact with the first paraxylylene film 14.**

Even assuming an adhesive material could be added to the Sato device between the FOP 10 and the second paraxylylene film 18, the adhesive material *would necessarily be in contact with the* polyparaxylylene film 14. Therefore, the condition of claims 1 and 9 of the present application that the adhesive material should not be in contact with the moisture resistant layer would not be satisfied.

For the reasons summarized above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 9 cannot be anticipated by Sato, and are allowable, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of the claims. In response to the rejection of claims depending from these independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that insomuch as independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable, claims depending therefrom are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

**Independent claims 16 and 24 and claims depending therefrom**

Claims 16 and 24 recite, *inter alia*, a radiation detector assembly having a moisture resistant layer disposed so that an edge portion of the moisture resistant layer is bonded to a detector substrate between an adhesive material and a contact finger area.

As discussed above, there is no teaching of an adhesive material in Sato. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Sato does not teach any co-relationship between any adhesive material and other layers of the structure. Therefore, Sato fails to teach the structures of claims 16 and 24.

For the reasons summarized above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 16 and 24 are allowable, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of the claims. In response to the rejection of claims depending from these independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that inasmuch as independent claims 16 and 24 are allowable, claims depending therefrom are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action summarized dependent claims 8, 13, 23 and 28 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sato in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0156113. Further, the Office Action summarized dependent claims 15, 20, 21 and 30 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sato in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,179,284.

Applicants respectfully submit that at least by virtue of their dependencies from allowable base claims 1, 9, 16 or 24, the above mentioned dependent claims 8, 13, 15, 20, 21, 23, 28 and 30 are believed to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider rejection of the claims.

**Conclusion**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/6/2005

79  
Patrick S. Yoder  
Reg. No. 37,479  
FLETCHER YODER  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545